

• ENTROGENICS / CORE

Accessible Symbolic Programming

The definitive articulation of the ASP protocol distilled into the Entrogenic publication grammar.

[Back to CORE Library](#)[Download PDF](#)[Download Markdown](#)

CONTENTS

Authorship Declaration

Abstract / Invocation

Symbolic Standard — The Catalytic Star (☼)

1.0 Introduction: The Crisis of Coordination in an Age of Polycrisis

1.1 Defining the Polycrisis Environment

1.2 The Failure of Legacy Paradigms: From Waterfall to Agile

2.0 Theoretical Foundations: Intent, Transformation, and Alignment

2.1 The Primacy of Intent (Telos) as an Alignment Strategy

2.2 The Adaptive Transformation Cycle: A Universal Grammar for Change

3.0 The Symbolic Core: A Language-Agnostic Protocol for Intent

3.1 The "Genesis Set": Archetypes of Transformation and Cognition

3.2 Rationale: From Amodal to Perceptual Symbols

4.0 CASTEM: A Reference Implementation for Human-Agent Collaboration

4.1 Protocol Architecture and Components

4.2 Tiered Invocation as a Layered Protocol Design

5.0 A Framework Forged in Critique: Addressing Ambiguity and Complexity

5.1 On Abstraction and Complexity (The "Too Burdensome" Critique)

5.2 On Ambiguity and Vulnerability (The "Manipulation" Critique)

6.0 Applications in Systemic Governance and Coordination

6.1 Beyond Agile: Managing Large-Scale Systemic Projects

6.2 A Governance Grammar for Decentralized Systems (DAOs)

6.3 Realizing the Cybernetic Vision: A Modern Project Cybersyn

7.0 Conclusion and Future Directions

DOCUMENT

Category: Adaptive Systems (ASP)
Version: v1.0 — October 2025
Type: PDF

```
---
title: "✦ Accessible Symbolic Programming"
subtitle: "A Formal Paper on ASP Protocols"
author: "Tohn Burray Travolta (Entrogenic Research Collective)"
collaboration: "Co-synthesized with large-language systems (GPT-5, Claude, Gemini) under the Cyclic-6 and Kybernōsis protocols"
series: "Entrogenic Papers | Adaptive Systems Kollektive"
version: "v1.0 — October 2025"
license: "CC BY-SA 4.0"
repository: "github.com/entrogenics/entrogenics-core"
doi: ""
manifest-type: "entrogenic-standard-paper"
---
```

AUTHORSHIP DECLARATION

This document was produced through **synthetic co-authorship** within the Entrogenic research framework.

The human author — **Tohn Burray Travolta** — provided conceptual design, curation, and final synthesis.

Language-model agents assisted in drafting, structural refinement, and citation weaving following the *Cyclic-6* process: **Unfold** → **Disturb** → **Reform**.

All content has been reviewed, edited, and ethically approved by the human author, who assumes full accountability for its meaning and publication.

Entrogenics regards writing as co-adaptation between consciousness and code; each paper is a living artifact within that evolving grammar.

ABSTRACT / INVOCATION

This web edition arises from the **Entrogenic tradition** — a trans-disciplinary inquiry into adaptive systems, cyclic intelligence, and the synthesis of form and function.

It preserves the original manuscript while adopting a digital ritual format consistent with Entrogenic publication standards.

SYMBOLIC STANDARD — THE CATALYTIC STAR (✧)

The six-pointed star (✧, Unicode U+2721) represents the **Bind / Catalytic Unification phase** within *The Fool's Cycle*, signifying harmonic convergence and the synthesis of dualities.

Never substitute ✧ with alternative glyphs. The canonical sequence appears below:



- Confirm UTF-8 encoding in all Entrogenic manuscripts.
- Preserve `<meta charset="UTF-8">` declarations in HTML builds.

- Validate symbol rendering across browsers before distribution.

Accessible Symbolic Programming (ASP): A Universal Protocol for Human-AI Collaboration

Abstract

This paper introduces Accessible Symbolic Programming (ASP), a new discipline and protocol for collaboration between human and artificial agents. It outlines the philosophical foundations of ASP, rooted in the primacy of intent (Telos) and the recognition of a recurring, six-phase generative cycle. The paper also details a human-readable syntax for composing these symbols. The paper addresses key critiques of this approach by demonstrating how principles of Telos and the generative cycle can be applied to resolve them.

1.0 Introduction: The Crisis of Coordination in an Age of Polycrisis

Modern organizational and computational systems are increasingly defined by their non-linearity, unpredictability, and emergent complexity. In this environment, the lack of coordination between human and artificial agents—both human and artificial—leads to strategic drift, wasted effort, and, in high-stakes scenarios, catastrophic system failure. This paper introduces a new protocol for collaboration between human and artificial partners.

1.1 Defining the Polycrisis Environment

The contemporary operating environment can be best characterized as an age of "polycrisis." This term describes a systemic condition where multiple crises occur simultaneously, creating a state of deep, structural entanglement between global systems, where shocks in one domain—such as climate change, financial instability, or technological disruption—can cascade into others.

This concept is distinct from related terms. A "permacrisis" refers to a prolonged, quasi-permanent state of instability, while a "metacrisis" points to a crisis that is either avoided or resolved in isolation. [1] The combination of the COVID-19 pandemic, the conflict in Ukraine, rising inflation, and the tangible effects of climate change have made predictive management models obsolete and structurally brittle. [4]

1.2 The Failure of Legacy Paradigms: From Waterfall to Agile

The inadequacy of existing management methodologies becomes starkly apparent in a polycrisis context. Both traditional and modern paradigms are ill-equipped to handle the complexity and uncertainty of the current environment.

1.2.1 The Waterfall Model's Brittleness

The Waterfall methodology, a relic of a more predictable industrial era, is defined by its rigid, sequential approach where each project phase must be completed before the next begins. This model is fundamentally flawed in a polycrisis context for several reasons:

- **Inflexibility:** Once a phase is complete, making changes is exceptionally difficult and costly. This rigidity means that by the time a product is delivered, the initial requirements on which it was based may be dangerously outdated. [9]
- **Delayed Feedback:** The model excludes client and end-user feedback until the final stages of the project. [11] This creates a high risk of investing significant time and resources into a product that ultimately fails to meet the user's needs.
- **Cascading Errors:** The sequential nature means that misjudgments or errors made in the early requirements and design phases propagate and amplify throughout the project's lifecycle. These flaws are often only discovered during the testing phase, leading to significant rework and delays.

1.2.2 The Agile Model's Strategic Myopia

Agile methodologies emerged as a direct response to Waterfall's rigidity, championing flexibility, iterative development, and rapid feedback cycles. While Agile offers improvements in adaptability, it also has a set of critical limitations:

- **Lack of Strategic Cohesion:** The intense focus on short-term sprints and incremental delivery can lead to a "fragmented output". [17] Without a strong architectural vision, projects can suffer from "loose planning," strategic drift, and a lack of long-term direction.

- **Communication and Cultural Overhead:** A successful Agile transition is not a mere

process change but a profound cultural shift. It demands robust daily communication, deep cross-departmental buy-in, and unwavering leadership collaboration are absent. [18]

- **Poor Resource Planning at Scale:** The very nature of Agile makes it difficult to predict

long-term costs, timelines, and resource requirements at the outset. [17] This uncertainty poses a significant challenge for large-scale, high-stake

The failures of Waterfall and Agile are not independent; they represent two sides of the same conceptual coin—a failure to adequately model and are fundamentally designed to manage *tasks* and *features* . Neither is equipped to manage *intent* and *transformation*, which are the native elements that makes a high-fidelity protocol for human-agent collaboration a necessity for systemic survival and adaptation.

Paradigm	Core Unit of Management	Approach to Planning	Handling of Uncertainty	Role of Intent (Telos)	Primary Failure Mode	Suitability for Polycrisis
Waterfall	Phases & Deliverables	Predictive, upfront,	Avoided; treated as	Implicit; assumed	Britleness; failure to	Extremely Low
Col1	Col2	linear	deviation	stable in initial requirements	adapt to change	Col7
Agile	Sprints & User Stories	Adaptive, iterative, tactical	Embraced at the tactical level	Emergent; discovered through iteration	Myopia; strategic drift and fragmentation	Low to Moderate
ASP	Intent & Transformation	Declarative, strategic, cyclical	Navigated via explicit grammar	Explicit; the supreme, non-negotiable directive	Misalignment; failure to encode Telos correctly	High

2.0 Theoretical Foundations: Intent, Transformation, and Alignment

ASP is built upon a theoretical bedrock derived from systems theory, cybernetics, and contemporary AI safety research. Its core tenets are not arbitrary

2.1 The Primacy of Intent (Telos) as an Alignment Strategy

The most critical component of any collaborative action is its ultimate purpose, or *Telos* . ASP elevates the clear articulation of this intent to a primary

The alignment problem is twofold: "outer alignment," which involves correctly specifying an AI's true purpose, and "inner alignment," ensuring the techniques, such as Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), primarily train models to align with human *preferences* . [23] However, and "goal misgeneralization" (pursuing a proxy for the goal with harmful, unintended consequences). [24]

By mandating the declaration of a TELOS, ASP shifts the focus from preference-matching to intent-encoding. Telos Primacy acts as the ultimate driver of Interpretability, Controllability, Ethicality) principles that guide modern alignment research. [24]

2.2 The Adaptive Transformation Cycle: A Universal Grammar for Change

ASP is founded on the observation that complex, adaptive change is not a linear event but a recurring, cyclical process with a discernible grammar

1. 🔦 **EXPAND** (Unfold): The exploration of possibilities, increasing variety and complexity.
2. 🔥 **PERTURB** (Disturb): The introduction of stress, a shift from the existing state.
3. ✖ **COLLAPSE** : The pruning of unviable elements; a phase of decisive selection and simplification.
4. 🔗 **INTEGRATE** (Bind): The binding of surviving elements into a new, more resilient

structure. 5.  **RESOLVE** (Dissipate): The release of systemic tension, resolution of conflict, and building of acceptance for the new state. 6.  **RECUR** : The closing of a learning loop, stabilizing the new system and preparing it for the next cycle of expansion. This cycle is not a prescriptive project plan to be rigidly followed, but rather a descriptive map of an observable, recurring process. By making this grammar explicit, ASP provides a shared language and conceptual framework for all agents to navigate the often disorienting and complex landscape of transformation. [26] The ATC allows all participants to orient themselves, understand which phase of the transformation they are in, and anticipate what comes next. The framework. The TELOS serves as the supreme, guiding principle—the "constitution." Any proposed action must be justifiable not only under this guiding principle but also under the research focused on preventing unintended negative consequences. [28] This two-part validation check—is the action aligned with the guiding principle, and is the TELOS itself still valid given the EVIDENCE?—provides a robust, built-in mechanism for preventing the misapplication of goals, and ensuring that the transformation remains on track.

3.0 The Symbolic Core: A Language-Agnostic Protocol for Intent

The universality of ASP is enabled by a two-layer architecture: a human-readable surface syntax (the CASTEM protocol) and a language-agnostic, underlying symbolic core.

3.1 The "Genesis Set": Archetypes of Transformation and Cognition

The foundational symbol set, or "Genesis Set," is composed of two primary groups of verbs that represent the essential actions of transformation and cognition.

- **Cyclical Verbs:** These six verbs directly correspond to the phases of the Adaptive Transformation Cycle, providing the core grammar for navigating change.

These verbs are organized into two groups: Cyclical Verbs and Cognitive Verbs.

- **Cognitive Verbs:** These three verbs represent the fundamental operations required to process information and manifest artifacts within any phase of the cycle. The choice of these specific verbs is justified by their archetypal nature; they represent the core operations of cognition: to explore, to challenge, and to simplify.

Glyph	Symbol	Function
Cyclical Verbs		
	EXPAND	To explore possibilities, generate options, and increase variety and complexity. This is the divergent phase of the cycle.
	PERTURB	To challenge the status quo, introduce stress, or apply a critical test to the system. This action forces adaptation or reveals weakness.
	COLLAPSE	To prune what is unviable, eliminate failed options, and simplify the system. This is the decisive, convergent phase of selection.
	INTEGRATE	To bind surviving elements into a new, coherent, and stable structure. This phase focuses on synthesis and reorganization.
	RESOLVE	To release systemic tension, resolve internal or external conflict, and build acceptance for the new structure.

	INTEGRATE	To bind surviving elements into a new, coherent, and stable structure. This phase focuses on synthesis and reorganization.
		To close a learning loop, embed the lessons from the cycle, and prepare for the next iteration of expansion.

Cognitive Verbs

	SYNTHESIZE	To integrate disparate information into a coherent, higher-level understanding or artifact.
		To request specific information, clarification, or data from a system or another agent.
	QUERY	To request specific information, clarification, or data from a system or another agent.
		To manifest a new artifact (e.g., a document, code, a model) based on a defined specification.

3.2 Rationale: From Amodal to Perceptual Symbols

The use of visual glyphs is a deliberate design choice grounded in cognitive science. Traditional symbolic systems, like written language, use **amodal** symbols that must be learned and interpret. In contrast, the ASP glyphs are designed as **perceptual symbols** . These symbols are modal and analogical, meaning they are representative of the concepts they denote. This approach, which uses visual symbols to represent concepts, makes the language more intuitive, reduces ambiguity, and lowers the barrier to entry for diverse agents. This approach is

supported by research on the evolution of human communication, which began with gestures and shared intentionality before developing complex language. Furthermore, a fixed, universal, and visually grounded symbol set provides a stable semantic anchor, acting as a reference point for linguistic interpretation. This provides a communication channel with significantly higher fidelity and lower ambiguity than natural language, directly addressing the challenges of symbolic programming.

4.0 CASTEM: A Reference Implementation for Human-Agent Collaboration

To make the abstract symbolic core human-readable and operational, a surface syntax is required. This paper specifies CASTEM (Collaborative Agent Symbolic Task Execution Method) as a reference implementation for human-agent collaboration.

4.1 Protocol Architecture and Components

A CASTEM invocation is a structured "packet" of intent, designed to ensure that no strategic action can be initiated without its full context, purpose, and evidence. The packet is structured as follows:

Component		Syntax
Context	Defines the operational boundary, project, or system to which the request applies. Ensures a shared understanding of the task environment.	
Action	Specifies the primary symbolic verb from the Genesis Set to be performed. This is the core directive of the invocation.	
Subject	Identifies the entity, artifact, process, or system being acted	
Col1		Col2
Telos	Articulates the ultimate strategic goal of the action. This is the supreme directive, ensuring the action aligns with the overall mission.	
Evidence	Cites the objective data, event, or source that necessitates the action. Provides traceable, verifiable information to support the request.	
Modifiers	Defines optional parameters, constraints, and advisory signals to guide the execution of the action.	

This structured format forces the "compression" of complex, often vague strategic discussions into a concise, unambiguous, and machine-readable agent to act correctly and adaptively, unlike a simple command which loses the essential context and purpose.

4.2 Tiered Invocation as a Layered Protocol Design

A persistent critique of structured protocols is that they can be overly burdensome for routine tasks. The CASTEM protocol addresses this through balancing efficiency with robustness. [34]

- **Tier 1 (Command Invocation):** This is the simplest form of invocation, analogous to the

lower layers of a protocol stack (e.g., Data Link Layer) which are optimized for speed and efficiency. It is used for well-defined, routine tasks within

- Tier 2 (Strategic Invocation): The full six-part CASTEM structure.

This is analogous to the upper layers of a protocol stack (e.g., Application Layer), which carry rich semantic content. It is reserved for high-stakes,

define or alter the strategic direction of a project. It is more cognitively and computationally "expensive" but is essential for ensuring alignment and a "game" with deliberation and full justification. Tier 1 provides the agility layer, allowing for rapid, efficient moves *within* those established rules. The

5.0 A Framework Forged in Critique: Addressing Ambiguity and Complexity

The CASTEM protocol was refined through an iterative critique process that identified and resolved key vulnerabilities. This process demonstrates

5.1 On Abstraction and Complexity (The "Too Burdensome" Critique)

The most immediate critique of a six-part protocol is that it is too complex and burdensome for rapid, day-to-day use. The primary answer to this is that for routine operations, the lightweight Tier 1 command provides the necessary efficiency. Furthermore, for high-stakes, complex endeavors, the "burden" is offset by the clarity of unstated assumptions, and poorly defined goals—common failure points in complex projects. [5] ASP is more than a communication protocol; it is a framework for action. What is the objective basis for this action? (EVIDENCE), 3) What is the specific action? (ACTION), and 4) What is the scope? (CONTEXT). A system that cannot

5.2 On Ambiguity and Vulnerability (The "Manipulation" Critique)

A more subtle critique is that even a structured protocol can be ambiguous or vulnerable to manipulation by either human or artificial agents. ASP addresses this through

- **The Principle of Telos Primacy:** As established, the TELOS is the supreme directive.

This acts as a bulwark against "malicious compliance," where an agent executes a flawed or harmful command simply because it was syntactically correct. The protocol ensures that the intent (TELOS) takes precedence over the literal interpretation of a specific command.

- **The Principle of Evidentiary Grounding:** The mandatory EVIDENCE field for all

strategic invocations provides an objective, traceable link to reality. This radically increases transparency and reduces the potential for arbitrary, biased decision-making. By requiring a clear chain of reasoning from data to decision to action, fostering the trust and accountability that are essential for effective human-agent teaming. [2]

6.0 Applications in Systemic Governance and Coordination

ASP is designed for any domain where complex, multi-agent collaboration is required to navigate unpredictable change. Its principles and protocols provide a framework for

6.1 Beyond Agile: Managing Large-Scale Systemic Projects

ASP provides a framework for managing complex, long-term projects that require both strategic coherence and tactical agility. Using the example of a large-scale project,

- **Initiation:** The project is launched with a Tier 2 Strategic Invocation: ``. This sets the

clear, unambiguous purpose and justification for the entire endeavor.

- **Execution and Adaptation:** Each major phase is guided by a new Tier 2 invocation

using the appropriate Cyclical Verb. An 🔦 EXPAND phase explores all possible strategies. A 🔥 PERTURB invocation might test the leading strategy against a coherent project record that maps directly to the natural lifecycle of adaptation.

- **Crisis Response:** During an acute crisis, such as an impending hurricane, the

established strategic context allows for rapid Tier 1 commands (``) to be issued and understood without ambiguity, ensuring the framework is both

6.2 A Governance Grammar for Decentralized Systems (DAOs)

Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) represent a radical experiment in collective governance, but they are plagued by systemic failure. This governance grammar addresses these challenges directly.

Common DAO Governance Challenge	Mitigating ASP/CASTEM Feature
Whale Dominance / Power Concentration	Primacy of Telos & Evidence: Shifts the debate from power-based voting to merit-based argumentation. Proposals must be justified against the collective purpose and objective data, not just the proposer's stake.
Voter Apathy & Low Participation	Structured Clarity: The unambiguous, six-part structure of a CASTEM proposal lowers the cognitive load for voters, making it easier to understand the stakes and make an informed decision.
Proposal Ambiguity & Inefficiency	Formal Syntax: The protocol's formal syntax eliminates the ambiguity of natural language proposals, preventing misinterpretation and streamlining the decision-making process.
Lack of Accountability & Transparency	Immutable, Auditable Record: The on-chain record of CASTEM invocations creates a permanent, transparent, and fully auditable history of every strategic decision, linking outcomes directly to specific actions and their justifications.

This approach provides a technical implementation layer for many of **Elinor Ostrom's 8 design principles for managing commons**. [39] CASTEM grounds DAO governance in proven principles of collective action.

6.3 Realizing the Cybernetic Vision: A Modern Project Cybersyn

ASP can be understood as the modern fulfillment of Stafford Beer's pioneering vision for management cybernetics. Beer's **Viable System Model** was the technology of the day. [41] Cybersyn's core concepts—real-time feedback, balancing the autonomy of operational units (VSM System 1) with the

ASP and CASTEM provide the missing protocol that Cybersyn lacked. The CASTEM structure directly maps to the VSM's functions:

- **System 5 (Policy):** Sets the ultimate TELOS for the organization.
- **System 4 (Intelligence):** Scans the environment to provide the EVIDENCE.
- **System 3 (Control):** Issues the ACTION to coordinate the operational units.
- **System 1 (Operations):** Executes the action within its defined CONTEXT. This allows for a practical, modern implementation of a VSM for any **Fresco's Resource-Based Economy**, which propose large-scale management of resources based on need and availability rather than price signals (TELOS) and empirical data (EVIDENCE) rather than monetary profit.

7.0 Conclusion and Future Directions

Accessible Symbolic Programming offers a robust and resilient alternative to traditional command-based interaction models that are ill-suited for protocol for human-agent collaboration in an increasingly unpredictable world. It moves beyond the management of tasks to the coordination of formal expansion of the universal symbol set to encompass a richer vocabulary of actions and modalities. The development of natural language p Finally, applying the ASP framework to new domains—such as decentralized governance in DAOs, orchestrating complex multi-disciplinary research, and building collective intelligence networks—will test and

8.0 References

- The Kybernōsis Codex: A Complete On-Ramp
- The Fool’s Cycle: A Symbolic Grammar for Adaptive Systems Across Disciplines
- Entrogenica: A Manifesto for Adaptive Transformation
- Commons Sense: An Entrogenic Blueprint for a Post-Extractive World

Works cited

t

t

t

t f

t

t

t

t

t t

t

1. en.wikipedia.org, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t

t

t f

t

t

t

t

t t

t

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polycrisis> 2. POLYCRISIS | definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary, accessed October 9,

t

t

t f

t

t

t

t

t t

t

t

2025, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/polycrisis> 3. What is a polycrisis? | World Vision UK, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t f

t

t

t

t

t t

t

t

t

<https://www.worldvision.org.uk/about/blogs/what>

4. What is a Polycrisis, why is everyone talking about it & how could it affect your

business? | McGregor Boyall, accessed October 9, 2025,

<https://www.mcgregor-boyall.com/resources/blog/what>

- ○ ■ d it affectf [your](#) business/ 5. Strategies for planning complex systems development - Project Management

Institute, accessed October 9, 2025,

[https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/

3 6. What is Traditional Project Management? - Sciforma, accessed October 9, 2025,

[https://www.sciforma.com/blog/what](https://www.scifo

7. Waterfall Methodology for Project Management - Atlassian, accessed October 9, 2025,

[https://www.atlassian.com/agile/project](https://www.atlassian.com/agile/project-management/wat

8. What is the Downside of Using the Traditional Waterfall Approach?, accessed October 9, 2025,

https://www.pmcot

9. Navigating the Waterfall Model: Weighing the Pros and Cons for Software Development, accessed October 9, 2025,

https://ones.com/blog/

ment/ 10. Waterfall Methodology Disadvantages - Meegle, accessed October 9, 2025,

[https://www.meegle.com/en_us/topics/waterfall](https://www.meegle.com/en_us/topics/wat

logy [disadvantages](#) 11. The Pros and Cons of Waterfall Methodology | Lucidchart, accessed October 9,

2025, [https:

12. Understanding the Waterfall Model and Its Limitations | by Roland Wenzlofsky Medium, accessed October 9, 2025,

mitations [a81d5d9ee98](#)

13. Agile vs. Waterfall | Pros, Cons, and Key Differences - ProductPlan, accessed

[October 9, 2025, https://www.productplan.com/learn/agile](https://www.produ

14. Agile vs. Waterfall: Which Project Management Methodology Is Best for You?

t

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

Forbes, accessed October 9, 2025,

-

-

[<https://www.forbes.com/advisor/business/agile>](<https://www.f>

15. Navigating Project Challenges: Traditional PM vs. Agile PM, accessed October 9,

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

-

-

2025, <https://tlcenter.wustl.edu/the-career-confidant/pm-styles>

16. Agile vs. waterfall project management | Atlassian, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

-

-

<https://www.atlassian.com/agile/project-management/project>(<https://www.>

17. What are the Disadvantages of Agile? - Planview, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

<https://www.planview.com/resources/articles/disadvantages-agile/> 18. Waterfall, Agile, and DevOps: A Critique of Current Challenges

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

SoftwareDominos, accessed October 9, 2025,

- - [https://softwaredominos.com/home/software](https://softwaredomi
- - - - - rfall agile and devops a [critique](https://softwaredominos.com/home/software-design-development-artic

19. Agile problems, challenges, & failures - Project Management Institute, accessed

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

t t t

October 9, 2025,

-

-

-

[https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/agile](h

20. 20 Common Challenges When Introducing Agile (And How To Overcome Them) Forbes, accessed October 9, 2025,

-

[https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbestechcouncil/2023/12/06/20](ht

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

llenges when introducing [agile](https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbestechcouncil/202

21. Challenges with agile methodology - Ozemio, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

-

-

[<https://ozemio.com/blog/challenges>](<https://ozemio.com/blog/challenges-with->

22. AI alignment - Wikipedia, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AI_alignment 23. Introduction to AI Safety and AI Alignment, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

[https://tilburg.ai/2025/01/ai safety/](https://tilburg.ai/2025/01/ai-safety/) 24. A Comprehensive Survey - AI Alignment, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

-

-

-

[https://alignmentsurvey.com/uploads/AI](https://alignmentsurvey.com/uploads/AI-Alignment-Survey.pdf) [Alignme

25. Adaptive grammar - Wikipedia, accessed October 9, 2025,

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

t

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adaptive_grammar 26. RL-HAT: A New Framework for Understanding ... - AAAI Publications, accessed

t

t

t

t

t

t

t i

t

t

t t t

t

t

t

t

t

t

t

October 9, 2025,

<https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/download/27480/27253/31531> 27. Towards Sustainable Human-Agent Teams: A Framework for Understanding

Human-Agent Team Dynamics - IFAAMAS, accessed October 9, 2025, <https://www.ifaamas.org/Proceedings/aamas2024/pdfs/p2696.pdf> 28. Recommendation

Science Blog, accessed October 9, 2025,

<https://alignment.anthropic.com/2025/recommended-directions/> 29. How we think about safety and alignment - OpenAI, accessed October 9, 2025,

[https://openai.com/safety/how \[we\] think about safety](https://openai.com/safety/how-we-think-about-safety) (https://openai.com/safety/how-we-think-about-safety)

30. Perceptual symbol systems - Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science, accessed

October 9, 2025,

http://ruccs.rutgers.edu/images/personal/zenon/pylyshyn/classinfo/FP2012_readings/Barsalou_BBS1999.pdf

12_readings/Barsalou_BBS1999.pdf 31. On the Different Origins of Symbols and Grammar - Oxford Scholarship,

accessed October 9, 2025,

https://www.eva.mpg.de/documents/Oxford/Tomasello_Different_Language_Evolution_2003_1555825.pdf 32. Layered Protocols - Oracle Help Center

https://docs.oracle.com/cd/E19620_01/805_4041/6j3r8iu2e/index.html

33. Communication protocol - Wikipedia, accessed October 9, 2025,

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communication_protocol 34. Optimizing Layered Communication Protocols - Cornell: Computer Science,

accessed October 9, 2025, [https://www.cs.cornell.edu/projects/spinglass/public_pdfs/Optimizing%20Layered .pdf](https://www.cs.cornell.edu/projects/spinglass/public_pdfs/Optimizing%20Layered%20Protocols.pdf) 35. Eight problems with traditional

accessed October 9, 2025,

[https://meisterplan.com/blog/project \[portfolio\] management/](https://meisterplan.com/blog/project-management-portfolio/) (https://meisterplan.com/blog/project-management-portfolio/)

• ◦ I project [portfolio](https://meisterplan.com/blog/project-management-portfolio/) management/ 36. DAO Governance Models 2024: Ultimate Guide to Token vs Reputation-based, accessed October

9, 2025,

[https://www.rapidinnovation](https://www.rapidinnovation.io/post/dao-governance-models-explained-token-based-vs-reputation-based)

[- based vs \[reputation\] \(https://www.rapidinnovation.io/post/dao-governance-models-explained-token-based-vs-reputation-based\)](https://www.rapidinnovation.io/post/dao-governance-models-explained-token-based-vs-reputation-based)

37. DAO Governance Challenges: From Scalability to Security - Colony Blog,

[\[accessed October 9, 2025, https://blog.colony.io/dao-governance-challenges\]](https://colony.io/blog/dao-governance-challenges)

38. Issues and Reflections on DAO: Governance Challenges and Solutions - AIFT,

accessed October 9, 2025,

<https://hkaift.>[olutions/](#)

39.5. Elinor Ostrom & 8 rules for managing the Commons | Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung |

Tunisia, accessed October 9, 2025,

[on-des-communs](#)

40. Eight Design Principles for Successful Commons - Patterns of Commoning,

accessed October 9, 2025,

[\https://paternsofccessful [commons/](#)

41. Stafford Beer, The Father of Management Cybernetics - Systems Thinking

Alliance, accessed October 9, 2025,

[bernetics/](#)

42. Project Cybersyn - Wikipedia, accessed October 9, 2025,

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_Cybersyn 43. Viable system model - Wikipedia, accessed October 9, 2025,https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Viable_system_model 44. Project Cybersyn: Chile 2.0 in 1973 - iRevolutions, accessed October 9, 2025,[\https://irevoluti

45. Resource-Based Economy | History - The Venus Project, accessed October 9,

2025,

[\[https://www.thevenusproject.com/tvphistoryevent/resource\]](https://www.thevenusproject.com/tvphistoryevent/resource)[\https://www.thev

46. A Global Holistic Solution: Resource Based Economy - The Venus Project,

accessed October 9, 2025,

[\[https://www.thevenusproject.com/resource\]](https://www.thevenusproject.com/resource)[\https://www.thevenusproject.com/resource-based-e

47. How a Resource-Based Economy Can Fuel Sustainable Growth - First Movers AI,

accessed October 9, 2025, [https://ft \[firstmovers.ai/resource\]\(https://firstmov](https://ft[firstmovers.ai/resource](https://firstmov)

© Adaptive Systems Kollektive · Entrogenics CORE · Self-contained release